



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/945,655	10/24/1997	JAN-ERIK LOFROTH	1103326-283	2968

1095 7590 09/05/2003

THOMAS HOXIE
NOVARTIS, CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 430/2
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER

WEBMAN, EDWARD J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

27

DATE MAILED

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☒ is extended to run _____ or continues to run 3 mo from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 8/26/03 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b. ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c. ☒ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

"FOR FILM FORMATION" SUGGESTS THAT THE
"MATRIX FORMULATION" FOLLOWING IS A FILM.
HOWEVER, THERE IS NO SUPPORT FOR A MATRIX IN
THE FORM OF A FILM, EXCEPT AS THE CLAIMED COAT,
ASSUMING THE MATRIX IS THE COAT IN THE "COATED
FORMULATION"

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: _____

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because _____

APPLICANTS ARGUE DIFFERENT FILMS, HOWEVER, FOLLOWS FROM
TEACH. OF THE PRIOR ART (COLUMN 5 LINE 31). PLEASE TRACKS PCC AS A

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

BINDER MATRIX

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☒ Other

APPLICANTS ARGUE A METHOD OF MAKING. HOWEVER,
SUCH METHODS ARE NOT CLAIMED. EVEN IF THEY WERE, THEY ARE NOT
CONSIDERED PATENTABLE VARIATIONS UNLESS THEY RESULT IN A
COMPOSITION DIFFERENT FROM THE PRIOR ART.